

REMARKS

Claims 2-11 are present in this application. Claims 2 and 9 are independent claims.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

§ 103(a) Rejection – Honore, Baranowski

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,551,065 (Honore) in view of U.S. Patent 6,658,267 (Baranowski). Applicants have amended claims 2 and 9. Applicants traverse the rejection based on the claims as amended.

Applicants submit that Honore and Baranowski, either alone or in combination fail to teach the claimed apparatus of claim 2 or the claimed wireless network terminal of claim 9. The headset in each cited reference receives a local signal for a headphone (Honore's signal 300 received by antenna 215; Baranowski's signal transmitted from antenna 125 to antenna 201 in the headset 200). Baranowski also teaches transmission of a signal from a microphone 300 via antenna 306. In other words, Baranowski discloses an antenna 201 in the headset for receiving a signal and an antenna 306 for transmitting a signal for the microphone 300. To the contrary, in the present invention, the transmission and reception card comprises a pole-shaped antenna.

According to the present specification, in the normal use state, the pole-shaped antenna never comes below the level of the user's face, such that the user's body does not obstruct a line of sight between a transmission/reception partner, such as a wireless access point, wireless home gateway, etc, and the pole-shaped antenna. In particular, the pole-shaped antenna in the normal use state is capable of obtaining high gain in all directions throughout 360 degrees in a horizontal plane. (see specification at paragraph 0020; see also directivity 21 in Fig. 4).

Applicants submit that Honore and Baranowski fail to teach the claimed pole-shaped antenna of the transmission and reception card set upright substantially in a vertical direction, and not below the level of the user's face, in the normal use state.

At least for these reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and drawn.

§103(a) REJECTION – Honore, Rydbeck

Claims 4, 7, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Honore and Baranowski in view of U.S. Patent 5,590,416 (Rydbeck). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 7, and 10 are dependent claims. At least for the reasons above for respective independent claims, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 4, 7, and 10, as well.

Furthermore, embodiments covered by claims 4, 7, and 10 are directed to an embodiment including the feature of wherein the mount is rotatable.

The Office Action admits that Honore and Baranowski fail to teach this claimed feature, and instead relies on Rydbeck for making up for this deficiency.

Rydbeck is directed to an antenna for a cellular radiotelephone. The antenna in Rydbeck can be moved into a position that is directed away from a face of the radiotelephone in order to reduce electromagnetic shielding that would be caused by the user's head.

To the contrary, Applicants submit that Honore fails to teach that its receiver antenna 215 would suffer from a problem of electromagnetic shielding caused by the user's head. Rather Honore's receiver is for receiving a short range signal 300 of public service bands reserved for personal communications (col. 4, lines 7-12). Honore's receiver is for personal or local transmission from a base entertainment unit (col. 3, lines 56-66). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that Honore's receiver is not for wireless communications of the range disclosed in Rydbeck. In other words, the teachings of Rydbeck do not apply to Honore, at least because Honore does not suffer from the problem addressed by Rydbeck.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that insufficient evidence is provided as a motivation to combine Honore, Baranowski, and Rydbeck. At least for this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and drawn.

§103(a) REJECTION – Honore, Maki

Claims 5, 8, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Honore and Baeanowski in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,199 (Maki). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5, 8, and 10 are dependent claims. At least for the reasons above for respective independent claims, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 5, 8, and 10, as well.

Furthermore, embodiments covered by claims 5, 8, and 11 include a “patch antenna.”

The Office Action admits that Honore and Baranowski fail to teach a patch antenna, and instead relies on Maki for making up for the deficiency. In particular, the Office Action alleges that GPS antenna 3 teaches the claimed patch antenna.

Maki is directed to a portable wireless receiver having a GPS antenna as a patch antenna. Maki teaches a main body 1 having an antenna for transmission and reception of radio waves by a transceiver unit (col. 2, lines 18-20). Thus, at most Maki teaches the modification of the headset unit of Honore to include a patch antenna for receiving GPS signals.

Because Maki’s patch antenna 3 only receives GPS signals, Applicants submit that Maki does not make up for the deficiency in Honore and Baranowski of failing to teach at least the claimed “transmission and reception card” comprising a pole-shaped antenna.

Accordingly, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/823,574
Amendment dated November 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 13, 2007

Docket No.: 2936-0216PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48,222
Terrell C. Birch
Registration No.: 19,382
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant